PATENT 20973-15

REMARKS

Claims 18-60 were pending in present application, to which claims 61-66 have been added. It is respectfully submitted that the pending claims define allowable subject matter.

Claims 18-60 have been rejected under various combinations of the prior art to Busack, Koehler, Allport, Perlman and Rallison. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for reasons set forth hereafter.

It is respectfully that the prior art fails to teach or suggest a portable wireless handheld device having the claimed structure. Among other things, the prior art fails to teach or suggest providing a portable wireless handheld device that receives video content or image content that is produced by a plurality of cameras located at the event that the user is attending while watching the event live. In addition, the prior art fails to teach or suggest providing, within a portable wireless handheld device, the signal processing logic that is configured for selectable operation by an user to select video content from at least of the plurality of video cameras (claim 18). Nor does the prior art teach or suggest an user interface for selecting at least one of the images from at least one of a plurality of cameras by an user (claim 36). In addition, the prior art fails to teach or suggest the use of a receiver that receives video content while at an event and where the event is occurring, thereby permitting the user to carry the portable wireless handheld device about the event and choose where to view the video content selected by the user while roaming at the event during the event (claim 18). Nor does the prior art teach or suggest a receiver that is configured to receive image signals while at an event and where the event is occurring, thereby permitting the user to carry the receiver about the event and choose where to view the selected the image signal while roaming about the event during the event (claim 36).

Busack describes an auto race monitoring system that is designed to provide a simulated race, during the race, to a receiver 40 that is located remote from the event. Busack's system is designed for the user who is <u>not</u> attending the event. In particular, attention is directed to the Disclosure of Invention section of Busack where an as aspect of the invention is to provide "an accurate replication of each vehicle". To do so, Busack's race monitoring system position location transmitters 20, 22 and 24 about a race track 12. Receivers in each race car generate an instantaneous location signal, based on signals from the transmitters 20, 22 and 24. From this

location information, a simulated race track is then created at a computer 40 that is located remote from the event. The computers 40 receive the simulated race information over the worldwide web 38. Busack does not describe any structure capable of providing video content or images to a wireless portable handheld device, to a user, while attending an event. The computers 40 are intended only for users remote from the event.

Moreover, Busack's system does not support reception at the computers 40 of video content originating from a plurality of cameras located at the event. Instead, the computers 40 generate a simulated race track and provide simulations of the positions of the cars on the simulated race track. There are no cameras utilized within Busack's system nor any discussion of how one would implement cameras in combinations with Busack's race simulator.

In the Outstanding Office Action, it is suggested that it would have been obvious to modify Busack's system based on the teachings of Koehler to allow a viewer to select one or more views from camera views provided from cameras in cars. The undersigned respectfully disagrees. There is no suggestion or motivation within the prior art to make such a modification to Busack's system.

Further, even if combined, the teachings of Koehler and Busack are both intended for users that are remote from the event. Busack's computers 40 are not portable and are not intended for use by users attending an event. Similarly, Koehler's system relies on remote computers 42 that also are not intended to be used at the event as a portable wireless handheld device.

Allport fails to make up for the deficiencies of Busack and Koehler. Allport describes a system for dual display interaction with an integrated television and internet content. Allport's system is entirely unrelated to the claimed invention and the inventions of Busack and Koehler and does not discuss or suggest anything in connection with a portable wireless handheld device to be used at an event while an user watches the event live. Perlman and Rallison fail to make up for the deficiencies of Busack, Koehler and Allport.

In view of forgoing, it is respectfully submitted that the pending claims are patentably distinct over Busack and Koehler.

VIA FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION 1-571-273-8300

In addition, it is submitted that the dependent claims recite additional patentably distinct features.

Claims 19 and 20 further define the receiver of the portable wireless handheld device to receive video content that also originates at another event that is remote from the event that the user is attending live. By providing remote video content, in addition to video content from a plurality of video cameras located at the local event, the user is afforded additional viewing options. Claim 21 further recites the additional limitation that the receiver wirelessly receives a plurality of audio signals associated with the event and that the portable user interface allows the user to select one of the audio signals. The prior art fails to teach or suggest this additional limitation of the receiver. Claim 25 further defines the device to have a portable user interface and further defines the receiver to receive a plurality of multiplexed video signals. One of the multiplexed video signals is selected using the user interface. For the avoidance, it should be understood that the multiplexed video signals may be received at the receiver over a common frequency or over separate frequencies. In addition, the video signals may be transmitted from a single transmitter or from multiple transmitters. The prior art fails to teach or suggest the reception at a wireless handheld device of a plurality of multiplexed video signals. Thus, the prior art necessarily fails to teach or suggest the use of a user interface that selects one of the multiplexed video signals.

For avoidance of doubt, it should be understood that the present claims are not being distinguished based on any specific type of portable wireless handheld device. For example, the portable wireless handheld device may represent a PDA, a head-mounted display, a binocular-style device, a laptop computer, a cell phone, a blackberry-type wireless device, and the like. Instead, the claimed invention is distinct over the prior art based upon the functionality of the structure within the device to receive video content or image content produced by a plurality of cameras located at the event and permitting the user to choose which of the cameras that the user desires to view while letting the user roam about the event while the event is occurring.

For avoidance of doubt, it should be understood that the claims are not limited to sporting events. Instead, the claims concern any type of live event, such concerts, conferences, presentations, and the like. It is also understood, that the events need not occur in a single

contained area, such in a stadium. For example, sporting events may occur over a large area, such as a Formula One race, a golf match, a tennis tournament at multiple courts, and the like.

For the avoidance of doubt, the distinctions over Busack, and the prior art as a whole, are transmission independent in that the claims are not limited to any particular type of wireless transmission or any particular configure of transmitters. For example, the receiver in the device may receive image signals over common or different wireless transmissions. The receiver in the device may receive the image signals from common or different transmitters. For example, the audio signals may be transmitted in the UHF frequency range, while the image signals are transmitted at a different frequency range (e.g., 2.5GHz). The image signals may be transmitted over common or different frequencies and may be time-division multiplexed, frequency division multiplexed, code division multiplexed and the like. For the avoidance of doubt, the distinctions over Busack, and the prior art as a whole, the claims are not limited solely to video signals. For example, the image signals may be still images, pictures, frozen images, live video, video clips and the like. The camera may be a video camera, a photographic camera and the like.

In view of forgoing comments it is respectfully submitted that the pending claims define allowable subject matter. Should anything remain in order to place the present application in condition for allowance, the examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully Submitted,

Dean D. Small, Registration No. 34,370

THE SMALL PATENT LAW GROUP LLP

611 Olive Street, Stc. 1611

St. Louis, Missouri 63101

(314) 584-4081